



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,522	08/18/2003	George H. Henderson	REGV101	4465

7590 11/16/2004

DYKAS, SHAVER & NIPPER, LLP
THE HOFF BUILDING
802 West Bannock St. , Suite 405
P.O. Box 877
Boise, ID 83701-0877

EXAMINER

PATEL, TAJASH D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3765

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

12

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/643,522

Applicant(s)

GEORGE HENDERSON

Examiner

Tejash D Patel

Art Unit

3765

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/7/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Galler et al. (US 6,035,449). Galler et al. (hereinafter Galler) discloses a clothing attachment device (10) including a first generally flat bar shaped magnet (44, 46, 48) that is configured to be removable against a second magnet (30, 32, 34) which has sufficient force to be held in a desired position along a portion of an article of clothing (12) that can be inherently pulled apart by manual forces, col. 2, line 54 – col. 5, line 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3765

4. Claims 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galler.

With regard to claim 2, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art that the first and second magnets of Galler can be made of any conventional magnetic material such as neodymium that was available at the time the device was made. Further, with regard to claim 4, it would have been obvious that the covering over the first and second magnets as shown in figure 2 can be padded as required for a particular application thereof or depending on the end use thereof.

With regard to claim 5, it would have been obvious that the first and second magnets can have a decorative portion thereon as a matter of design choice.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galler as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Marbacher (US 4,121,324). Galler discloses the invention as set forth above except for showing the second magnet be configured to maintain a shoulder strap in a desired position.

Marbacher discloses a magnetic fastening device for shoulder straps, col. 1, lines 1-10, including a magnet (4) being positioned within a recess (3') thereof.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that the device of Galler can be used to secured a shoulder strap having a magnet therein as taught by Marbacher, in order to maintain the shoulder strap in a desired position relative to the body. Further, it is obvious that the first and second magnet of Galler being positioned on an outside and a inside of the clothing, respectively can be encased in a padded material as required for a particular application thereof.

With regard to claim 10, it would have been obvious that the second magnet of Galler when viewed with Marbacher can have a decorative portion/adornment thereon as a matter of design choice.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3765

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tejash Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-4993. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

November 7, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tejash Patel', with a stylized, flowing script.

**TEJASH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER**